

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

GOLD RUSH DISTRICT  
101 "J" STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
(916) 445-7373

April 17, 1996

Projects Coordinator  
The Resources Agency  
c/o Nadine Gayou  
1020 Ninth Street, 3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814Re: CALFED Bay Delta Program  
SCH # 96032083

Dear Ms. Gayou,

The District Superintendents for California Department of Parks and Recreation having responsibilities in the project area have reviewed the CALFED Bay Delta Program documents. The following is a compiled response from those individuals:

Ten concept alternatives were described in the report, each of which addresses goals and objectives for the CALFED program. A key measuring tool is the mission statement for the program (p. 6):

***The mission of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program is to develop a long-term comprehensive plan that will restore ecological health and improve water management for beneficial uses of the Bay-Delta system.***

Six "solution principles" were offered. We recommend three more:

1. New project work to have minimal environmental impacts.
2. That there be efficiency improvements and wise use of the water resource.
3. That the alternatives be cost effective (as opposed to "be affordable").

Our recommendations are as follows:

- Alternative A, "Executive Demand Management" offers habitat restoration, infrastructure improvements, and 100 TAF of storage in the Delta where it can be redirected efficiently. This alternative appropriately focuses on efficiency and wise use of the resource. **This alternative satisfies the mission very well and should receive further consideration.**

- Alternative F, "Extensive habitat Restoration with Storage" emphasizes habitat restoration, as does the mission, and provides flexibility in management by incorporating 300 to 400 TAF of storage in the south delta. **This alternative satisfies the mission very well and should receive further consideration.**
- Alternative H, "Chain of Lakes Conveyance", provides 300 to 600 TAF of storage in the Delta where there is the maximum flexibility for direction to need, and offers the possibility for several significant ecosystem and water supply quality improvements. **This creative alternative should definitely receive further consideration.**
- Alternative E, "Delta Channel Habitat and Conveyance", has habitat elements that make it worthwhile for further consideration. However, it does not address critical delta environmental and water quality issues such as measures counter reverse flow or salinity control. It also does not describe improvements to the water management program for beneficial uses. **This alternative should be considered further, but with modifications.**

We also recommend that the component, "reduce demand", should be extensively incorporated in every proposal.

We recommend the following be deleted from consideration:

- φ Alternative J, "East Side Conveyance", meets the needs of the mission, but does so by "including all habitat improvements found in Alternative F." The new construction of an east side conveyance will greatly impact natural and cultural resources located along its route, including significant blue oak forests. Impacts from construction will offset benefits of the restoration work done elsewhere in this alternative. Additionally, this project appears expensive for the net benefit to be gained-- 15-20,000 cfs along the east side of the valley.
- φ Alternative I is similar to J, but impacts the west side of the valley.
- φ Alternative B, "New Storage to Improve Delta Flow", is a very expensive project that appears to offer little benefit. Alternative B offers the least upper Sacramento River restoration of any of the alternatives.
- φ Alternatives C and D also include south of the delta storage proposals. Storage south of the delta, in general, offers the less efficiency for redirection of water to needed areas. Additional south of the delta storage appears somewhat redundant, especially with the two new storage projects currently in progress south of the delta: Los Vaqueros Reservoir near Livermore, and Domenigoni Valley Reservoir in southern California (a Municipal Water District project).

Alternatives B, C, and D also are the weakest of the alternatives in meeting the expressed mission to restore ecological health, particularly in the upper Sacramento River System.

φ Alternatives G and I involve significant new construction with considerable additional environmental impacts that appear questionable, considering the benefits received.

If there are any questions relative to these comments, they should be directed to Associate Park and Recreation Specialist Stephen C. Hill at (209) 826-1196.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald L. Brean". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Ronald L. Brean  
District Superintendent

c.c.: Richard Rayburn  
Stephen Hill  
Ron Schafer  
Bud Getty  
Noah Tilghman